

1
2 Green Oak Charter Township
3 Planning Commission
4 Regular Meeting Minutes
5 May 4, 2017

6 Approved: _____

7 The meeting was called to order by Ms. Sellis at 7:00 p.m.
8

9 Roll Call Tim Keyser
10 : Sarah Pearsall
11 Michael Sedlak
12 Deborah Sellis
13 Michelle Stock, observing only
14

15 Absent: Keith Lee
16 Lamberto Smigliani
17

18 Also Present: Debra McKenzie, Zoning Administrator
19 Paul Montagno, Carlisle Wortman
20 Leslie Zawada, CES
21

22 Guests: 9
23
24

25 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

26
27 **Motion by Pearsall, second by Sedlak**
28 **To approve the agenda as presented.**
29

30 **Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**
31 **Nays: None**
32

33 **MOTION APPROVED**

34
35 **Approval of the April 6, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes**

36
37 **Motion by Pearsall, second by Sedlak**
38 **To approve the minutes of April 6, 2017 as presented.**
39

40 **Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**
41 **Nays: None**
42

43 **MOTION APPROVED**

44
45 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC** - None
46

47 **BUSINESS ITEMS**

48
49 **1. Legacy Center Phase 1 (SP01-2017) Site Plan Approval Parcel #4716-20-100-**

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98

003

**Representing Legacy Center: Rodney Goble
Thom Dumond**

Mr. Montagno explained this is the Legacy Center site plan for the ballfields. This was shown at the last meeting and the site plan was revised twice since then. An engineering report was also received. He noted his report as a draft, but in general there were great improvements since that time. By and large the proposal is the same as was seen before.

They have been working with the applicant to essentially replace the old plan and show the changes that were made to the site since the original approval. Since the last review all the site data has been updated the setbacks have been shown on the plans and the site arrangement is consistent with what they saw before and with the PD site plan that was approved earlier this year.

He has quite a bit of discussion regarding circulation and roadways. Goble drive runs through the site and provides access to all the parking lots and facilities within the site. There are pedestrian facilities that run along that road, they have suggested previously to run the sidewalk along Rickett Road and that was done in the plan that was completed on Tuesday but he understood there were some changes to that. Ultimately, the question that they discussed quite a bit was whether the pathway should be installed along the frontage. The applicant did provide a letter with a number of reasons why they shouldn't put that in. At a minimum the pathway should be extended to the internal pathway. It may be appropriate to extend the path to the entrance at Rickett. With regard to the internal pathway, they suggested it should be more substantial material instead of woodchip.

There was some concern about a crossing by the round about. Examples of that were provided and they would rely on the road commission and there may be some suggestions about an alternative crossing. They do feel it is an important crosswalk for this facility.

With regard to grading, defer to Township Engineer. Parking calculations were updated and combined indicating the requirements. He would suggest that be cleaned up so it's more concise instead of 3 columns. The required parking spaces are 1214.57, proposed spaces are 1193 spaces, and at 80% capacity the required spaces are 1035.97. The plans note that 1155 are being built which is short of the requirement and short of what they are proposing. This also includes phase 2 which it should not. Those spaces that aren't being installed now are for future buildings. There is clean up that is needed in that area.

With regard to landscaping and screening, they have since combined into one concise plan. The parking lot is correct but have not had the opportunity to look at the entire site but could be handled on an administrative level. A new lighting plan has been submitted. The photometric grid does not go out to the edge of the site, the engineer stated that they would provide that the light level goes down to zero at the property lines. The biggest issue is glare. The detail provided didn't not show a shield on the light, and they need to make sure there is one.

99 In general the plans have been largely cleaned up, they have updated the plan to act as
100 a final site plan for the previously approved plan.

101
102 Ms. Zawada refereed to her May 2, 2017 review letter. In their previous reviews they had
103 concerns about the grading adjacent to the roadway, the applicant addressed those
104 concerns and the site plan does meet the Engineering Standards regarding grading. She
105 would recommend approval as noted of the site plan conditional that detailed engineering
106 review will follow should they receive approval from the Planning Commission.

107
108 Mr. Goble explained they have a better plan after the recent submittal and have made
109 updates with smaller details. They have spent most time responding from the second
110 review dated 4/24/17 and he believed since that review there was significant progress
111 made and he believed the CES review is also indication of their active pursuit of an
112 approvable site plan.

113
114 The revision to the sidewalk plan would include connectivity from the southwest lot to the
115 west lot and that is a better plan. They do not agree with the internal connection since it
116 would not be connecting to anything along Rickett. There was already a woodchip path
117 started with a significant amount of woodchips on site, they would agree to continue that
118 path with woodchip. They agree to update to an asphalt path if they perceive it is needed
119 if the woodchip path becomes difficult to maintain it could be approved administratively to
120 go from a woodchip path to asphalt.

121
122 In regards to a non-motorized path they are not including any component of that at this
123 time. They would agree to complete the path from the north property line along Rickett
124 Road to the south connecting internal pathway. It may even be to their benefit to complete
125 their section of the path and boardwalk in conjunction with the Township contractors.
126 There is an existing pathway ordinance that would be relevant for this 2017 site plan
127 application that was not in existence in 2012. They feel there is support around the
128 challenges that would ultimately lead to a path that goes no-where, and they would like
129 to construct their path at which time it is in conjunction with the pathway from Hawkins to
130 their site. They do still have significant concerns with the pathway on their property that
131 was supported by the Livingston Count Water Authority that was identified as challenging
132 around getting approval for a bridge over the Huron River, and or private residents
133 easements. A pathway ordinance is in place and they want to be in compliance with that.
134 They would like to add language to their approval at which time the pathway is approved
135 they can build the pathway on the site in conjunction with the Township.

136
137 There were a lot of site plan improvements. They are tearing out some parking to help
138 drainage and curbing with islands, cut out some existing asphalt so the curbs can be in
139 place. The open space is significant, they may or may not really identified the amount of
140 open space and significant permeable areas in the parking islands.

141
142 Regarding lighting in 2010-2012 lighting was a significant concern. The poles were 8
143 poles, 4 being outward facing and 4 being inward facing. There is no opportunity to
144 prevent glare or prevent the light from shining outward. When lights turn on, it lights up
145 an area, and the efforts to limit that was to not start a game after 9:30 p.m. For clarity,
146 the light poles that are submitted are the exact same number of light poles. What has
147 been identified as additional fixtures, they have gone from 8 fixtures to 10 fixtures. There

148 is the same amount of poles but because of the baseball orientation they now have 6
149 fixtures facing inward and 4 fixtures facing outward. The two fields are internal to the site
150 they are not at Rickett Road, the change has been the internal orientation of a soccer
151 field to the baseball field. The number of light poles is the same, the light fixtures
152 increased, the fixture count has gone up. They are proposing LED fixtures.

153
154 Mr. Dumond explained they did have shields on the fixtures and he didn't see a problem
155 adding those now.

156
157 Ms. Stock questioned what would the end time be for a game starting at 9:30 p.m. Mr.
158 Dumond stated when you look at the length, some games could go quite long. They will
159 be reasonable and will not have midnight games. Ms. Sellis asked what time of year will
160 the fields be used. Mr. Goble stated they would have approval for 7 nights a week, but it
161 is a short season to be out at night. In the fall they start to need lights. They never wanted
162 to predetermine which fields would be lit and which wouldn't. A fall league ends at the
163 start of October.

164
165 Clerk Sedlak met with Mr. Goble this morning and it was through those discussions that
166 they changed the internal sidewalks. He confirmed they will have the appropriate lowered
167 sidewalks at the crosswalks and the appropriate lights. It was his suggestion that the
168 remainder of the sidewalk going from west parking lot to Rickett Road wouldn't be
169 necessary if he wasn't going to build a pathway. He explained the Road Commission
170 will decide where the crossing is located. Mr. Goble stated there is a water main that
171 would not be appropriate to build on top of, there are road right of ways, existing site plan
172 already in place and they've already conveyed a significant amount of land, topography
173 also becomes an issue. They relocated DTE overhead lines and they've spoken with
174 many individuals and it's not that they don't want to install the path but there is a lot of
175 conflict. Clerk Sedlak asked if the crossing end up being at the round about would they
176 consider putting that pathway connect to their internal path. Mr. Goble stated yes, on
177 their property if it isn't affecting their site, they would not be open to relocating fencing or
178 relocating poles.

179
180 Ms. Zawada explained earlier in their presentation Mr. Goble mentioned they would be
181 comfortable constructing the pathway if the rest of Rickett Road was financed and ready.
182 Mr. Goble stated yes, from the north which would include a boardwalk across the wetlands
183 and a connector point from that boardwalk from the north heading south to their internal
184 pathway, and at that time the internal pathway would function as a way to get around their
185 site to the connectivity that would happen east and connecting north and south at Winans
186 Lake Road and Whitmore Lake. There will be pathway on the south side of Winans
187 Lake Road, so they have connectivity east and west. They think the more appropriate
188 connecting would be at their main entrance, if it was determined that connecting should
189 be east or west of that then that connectivity would start coming together.

190
191 Mr. Montagno explained there will be a need for some sort of pedestrian crossing at the
192 round about at the intersection he would love for them to explore the opportunity and put
193 in a sidewalk or a section of a pathway that runs along the road at the Rickett Road
194 entrance. Ms. Stock questioned the pathway that dead ends between fields 8 and 7 and
195 she wondered if they could extend the wood chip pathway to the parking lot. Mr. Goble
196 stated that they could extend the woodchip path along Rickett Road to connect to the

197 parking lot.

198

199 Ms. Sellis questioned how often they will maintain the pathway. Mr. Goble explained at
200 the request of the Planning Commission in 2012, the woodchip path was recommended
201 to be a natural element. They would maintain it, and they have materials on site, if at
202 some point in the future it becomes too hard to maintain then they will improve it. He
203 would like to make that change if needed administratively.

204

205 Ms. Sellis read the email from resident Gary Tobel and his concerns regarding the lighting.
206 Mr. Goble explained they are proposing the same amount of light poles. The two new
207 fields are not the fields that were previously approved at Rickett. The two new fields are
208 internal to the site and there will not be any differences of the light impact compared to
209 the 2012 site plan. They will provide light calculations to the end of the property. There
210 was not any construction of berms and that is part of this phase in construction as
211 designed and approved in the original landscaping plan. Mr. Dumond commented that
212 the pathway would take up some of the space so the berms and landscaping could be
213 less.

214

215 Clerk Sedlak reviewed the Carlisle Wortman listed items as follows:

216

- 217 1. Ramps must be indicated at all pointes where a sidewalk intersects a crossing.
- 218 2. Previously proposed raised crosswalks should be replaced on the plan and
219 installed.
- 220 3. Consider adding “drop off lane only” signs and check with the fire marshal on
221 whether the lane should be also be designated as a fire lane.
- 222 4. Use limestone fines for the internal pathway surface. The Commission agreed to
223 add the pathway can be upgraded and administratively approved.
- 224 5. All notations related to the pathways must be cleaned up.
- 225 6. Install the section of non-motorized pathway along the site frontage on Rickett
226 Road in accordance with the Township’s Pathway Ordinance. The Commission
227 agreed to have an additional agreement for when the pathway will start
228 construction and approved by the Township Attorney.
- 229 7. Updated plans to address the comments provided by the Township Engineer
230 related to grading and drainage.
- 231 8. Updated parking calculations and drawings based on the comments.
- 232 9. Remove parking associated with phase 2 from the calculations.
- 233 10. Update the new lighting plan to include all information required in Section 38-364
234 superficially demonstrating that lights are appropriated at property lines and
235 confirm the glare or fixture does not pass the property line in any direction.

236

237 Mr. Goble agreed to all of the items. Mr. Goble explained they meet the parking
238 requirements for the current phase. Mr. Montagno stated the calculations include a lot of
239 uses, Mr. Goble explained it includes everything even for future phasing of Legacy
240 Center. Mr. Montagno stated as they work on the parking he would like to work with them
241 on that so it’s clear.

242

243 **Motion by Sedlak, second by Pearsall**

244 **Motion to recommend approval for Legacy Center Phase 1 SP01-2017 final**
245 **site plan also known as Legacy Center ballfields with the following**

246 **conditions:**
247 **The applicant address outstanding comments that were presented at**
248 **tonight’s meeting, and any additional information to be reviewed**
249 **administratively and at which time if there are no major deviations the site**
250 **plan will and would be approved administratively by an administrative**
251 **committee.**

252
253 **In addition the recommendations from the Carlisle Wortman letter dated**
254 **5/4/17 are included as follows: Item 1, 2, and 3 as written. Item 4 changes**
255 **to “applicant is free to upgrade woodchip pathway and will be**
256 **administratively approved”. Item 5 as written. Item 6 changed to read “to**
257 **install the section of non-motorized pathway along the site frontage on**
258 **Rickett Road in accordance with the Township’s Pathway Ordinance.**
259 **When the pathway and Master Plan construction starts via a separate**
260 **agreement that would be approved by the Township Attorney”. Item 7, 8, 9**
261 **and 10 as written.**

262
263 **There will be an administrative review by Carlisle Wortman on the**
264 **landscaping details. To assure compliance with the PUD and applicable**
265 **statutes.**

266
267 **Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**
268 **Nays: None**

269
270 **MOTION APPROVED**

271
272 **B. Discussion on Text Amendment to Building Height 38-1, Definitions**

273
274 Mr. Montagno explained this was brought up when they were discussing planning
275 priorities for the year and updating standards to be more consistent with more
276 contemporary standards. Identified by staff that deal with height restrictions since there
277 are consistent issues with meeting the ordinance as it stands. He put forth some
278 language that would address this issue. They are looking at updating the height from 28’
279 to 30’ and update the language as to how calculations are done.

280
281 Ms. McKenzie explained right now they do the average. She would like them to look at
282 the ordinance, update it and make some changes.

283
284 The Commission should provide any commentary and what was suggested so far and
285 then a public hearing will be held and a recommendation made to the Board. Mr.
286 Montagno will move forward and begin the process to set a public hearing.

287
288 **C. Discussion on proactive rezoning of properties in Section 17 within the RF**
289 **zoning district**

290
291 Ms. McKenzie explained they would like to rezone properties in Section 17 that are
292 currently zoned RF and make zone it R2 which would then allow residents to combine
293 their lots. She explained only one part of the subdivision was done and not the other part,
294 she wasn’t sure why that was done.

295 Mr. Montagno explained they would also need a public hearing on this one and he can
296 move forward with that. There were no concerns from the Planning Commission.

297

298 **REPORTS**

299

300 **Chairman** – None

301 **Township Board Representative** – Clerk Sedlak brought the Commission up to date
302 regarding the last Board meeting. Including an update regarding the purchase of land for
303 the new police/fire station.

304 **ZBA Representative**- None

305 **Planning Consultant** – None

306

307 **Correspondence** – Ms. McKenzie reported that the Legacy Park residential will be
308 coming soon.

309

310 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC** - None

311

312

313 **ADJOURNMENT**

314

315 Ms. Sellis adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 8:26 p.m. due to no further
316 business.

317

318 Respectfully Submitted,

319

320 *Kellie Angelosanto*

321

322 Kellie Angelosanto

323 Recording Secretary

324